United Nations A/C.1/59/PV.19

General Assembly
Fifty-ninth session
Official Records

First Committee
19th meeting
Thursday, 28 October 2004, 3 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. De Alba ..... (Mexico)

The meeting was called to order at 3.35 p.m.

Agenda items 57 to 72 (*continued*)

Action on all draft resolutions submitted under all disarmament and international security agenda items

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): Before we continue our work, I wish to inform members that the situation foreseen yesterday with regard to the dearth of draft resolutions ready for the Committee's consideration has come to pass, and I have thus decided to cancel tomorrow afternoon's meeting. I urge everyone to use tomorrow for intensive informal consultations, which will enable us to achieve better results beginning next Monday.

In this decision-making process, I know that at least a couple of informal meetings have already been scheduled, including an exercise that will be led by the chairmanship. I believe all draft resolutions still requiring some time for consultations will have to be dealt with tomorrow, taking advantage of the free time tomorrow morning and afternoon.

This afternoon, we shall continue the Committee's work related to action on all draft resolutions contained in revision 1 of unofficial document 3. I shall use the same procedure as in past meetings: we shall deal with general comments and explanations of vote by cluster, not by draft resolution. With that understanding, I shall begin with cluster 1, on nuclear weapons.

As no delegation wishes to make general comments, I now call on those representatives who wish to speak in explanation of vote or position on any of the draft resolutions under this cluster.

Mr. Hu Xiaodi (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): Before we take action on three of the draft resolutions on nuclear disarmament, A/C.1/59/L.22, A/C.1/59/L.23 and A/C.1/59/L.26/Rev.1, the Chinese delegation would like to explain its position in the context of China's basic views and policy on nuclear disarmament.

China has always supported the total prohibition and complete destruction of nuclear weapons. We believe that, in the process of promoting that objective, the following are essential. All nuclear disarmament measures — including interim steps — should be consistent with the principle of maintaining global strategic stability and undiminished security for all countries. The countries possessing the largest and most advanced nuclear arsenals should make substantial further reductions in those arsenals in a verifiable and irreversible manner, thereby creating favourable conditions for complete nuclear disarmament. All nuclear-weapon States should pledge not to be the first to use nuclear weapons and should unconditionally commit themselves not to use nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States or States in nuclear-weapon-free zones. Prevention of the weaponization of outer space and of an arms race in outer space would help to promote the nuclear disarmament process.

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-154A. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

We support the main thrust, objective and content of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.26/Rev.1 and the other two draft resolutions aimed at promoting nuclear disarmament and achieving a world free of nuclear weapons at an early date. However, they do not reflect some of the basic points I mentioned. Therefore, further improvements are warranted.

We will vote in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Nevertheless, we have reservations concerning some parts of the text. For example, it fails to reflect the fact that non-first use of nuclear weapons and the prevention of an arms race in outer space would help to promote the nuclear disarmament process. Regarding transparency in nuclear disarmament measures, it fails to refer to the fact that nuclear transparency is related to an international climate of peace, stability and trust and should be considered in the nuclear disarmament negotiation process. In addition, the concept and definition of non-strategic nuclear weapons mentioned in the draft resolution are not clear.

We shall abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons", because it fails to mention some of the fundamental principles of nuclear disarmament. Moreover, a few of the measures that it proposes are premature for implementation in the current international situation.

Mr. Carriedo Tomás (Spain) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

Spain is a State that is firmly committed to peace and to honouring its commitments to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation. Spain deems both of those concepts and objectives —disarmament and non-proliferation — to be inextricably linked: they reinforce each other as part of the effort to attain the single broader goal of international peace and security.

In that vein, Spain has always pursued an absolutely responsible and balanced policy consistent with its international and regional security commitments. One more proof of that commitment to peace and to nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation is Spain's decision this year to sponsor, for the first time on such a text, the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.23, "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". We have always backed previous draft resolutions on this subject, deeming them balanced and likely to give rise to global consensus.

As regards draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22 on accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments, Spain wishes to pay tribute to the constructive efforts of the New Agenda Coalition, coordinated this year by Sweden, which led to this draft resolution. The draft resolution represents a step in the right direction towards the formulation of a more balanced and more feasible text likely to rally global consensus. However, Spain feels that there is still room for improving the present text and, because of time considerations, we feel that this is not the moment for us to reconsider our abstention.

Mr. Baeidi-Nejad (Islamic Republic of Iran): I have taken the floor to explain my delegation's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". My delegation shares the spirit of the draft resolution and agrees with elements of the preambular and operative parts. We therefore supported similar draft resolutions in previous years, including last year.

This year, the delegation of Japan, without prior consultations on the new draft resolution, has introduced approximately 20 new substantive paragraphs and other suggestions, many of which have important and broad implications for the ongoing nuclear disarmament agenda and negotiations, particularly now, when we are on the threshold of the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. For example, operative paragraph 8 stresses the importance of the development the of Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) verification regime. This is not comprehensible. Since the CTBT is not yet in force, it is hard to imagine that its verification regime could be further developed. My delegation has therefore decided to abstain in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status".

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1, entitled "Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Mongolia at the Committee's 15th meeting, held on 22 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1 and A/C.1/59/INF/2/Add.3. In addition, the United States of America has become a sponsor of the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1 have requested that the Committee adopt the draft resolution without a vote. May I take it that the Committee wishes to adopt the draft resolution?

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Before proceeding to the consideration of the draft resolution as a whole, a separate vote has been requested on operative paragraph 2. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Sweden at the Committee's 11th meeting, held on 19 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.22 and A/C.1/59/INF/2/Add.2 and Add.3.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 2, which reads as follows:

"Also calls upon all States to spare no efforts to achieve universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty."

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, India, Israel, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Mauritius, Monaco, Pakistan, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22 was retained by 153 votes to 4, with 5 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We shall now take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I now give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Germany, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Rwanda, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

France, Israel, Latvia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Australia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Italy, Monaco, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia and Montenegro, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, as a whole, was adopted by 135 votes to 5, with 25 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Japan at the Committee's 11th meeting, held on 19 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.23 and A/C.1/59/INF/2 and Addenda 1, 2 and 3. In addition, Guinea-Bissau, Samoa, Uzbekistan and Zambia have now become sponsors of the draft resolution.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Equatorial Guinea, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada,

Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Indonesia, Iraq, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Micronesia (Federated States of), Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nepal, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Palau, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

India, United States of America

Abstaining:

Bhutan, Brazil, China, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Israel, Malta, Mexico, Myanmar, New Zealand, Pakistan, South Africa, Sweden

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23 was adopted by 151 votes to 2, with 16 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

A separate vote on operative paragraph 1 has been requested. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia at the Committee's 11th meeting, held on 19 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.39 and A/C.1/59/INF/2/Add.1, 2, 3 and 5. In addition, Jamaica, Kuwait and Timor-Leste have also become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Committee will now proceed to take a separate vote on operative paragraph 1, which reads as follows:

"Underlines once again the unanimous conclusion of the International Court of Justice that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control".

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Myanmar, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar,

Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia and Montenegro, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United States of America

Abstaining:

Belarus, France, Latvia, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Uzbekistan

Operative paragraph 1 of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39 was retained by 156 votes to 3, with 5 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39 as a whole. A recorded vote has been requested.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39 as a whole.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Gabon, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Jamaica, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Rwanda, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, San Marino, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somalia, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Timor-Leste, Togo, Tonga, Tunisia, Turkmenistan, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of), Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Albania, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Israel, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Turkey, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Andorra, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Liechtenstein, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Serbia and Montenegro, Switzerland, Uzbekistan

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39, as a whole, was adopted by 118 votes to 28, with 21 abstentions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those representatives wishing to explain their votes or positions on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Mine (Japan): I would like to explain Japan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, just adopted, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", which Japan supported in the voting.

The draft resolution, submitted by the New Agenda Coalition, has been much improved compared with last year's resolution 58/51, entitled "Towards a

nuclear-weapon-free world: a new agenda", and offers effective approaches towards nuclear disarmament.

Japan does not necessarily agree with all of the points contained in the draft resolution. However, we support its overall objectives, with a view to engendering a favourable atmosphere for nuclear disarmament in the leadup to the 2005 Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We therefore decided to support the draft resolution.

I would like now to explain Japan's vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.39, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*". First of all, we highly appreciate Malaysia's sincere attitude and its firm commitment to the goal of achieving nuclear disarmament, which led to draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39 being proposed. Japan also believes that the use of nuclear weapons — because of their immense power to cause destruction and death and injury to human beings — is clearly contrary to the fundamental humanitarianism that informs international law and provides its philosophical foundation. Therefore, we would like to stress that nuclear weapons should never again be used and that continuous efforts should be made to achieve a world free of nuclear weapons.

However, the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which this draft resolution addresses, clearly demonstrates the complexity of the subject. Japan supports the unanimous opinion of the judges of the ICJ regarding the existing obligation under international law to pursue nuclear disarmament and to conclude the negotiations on that issue in good faith.

Japan firmly believes that we must take concrete measures to achieve steady, step-by-step progress in nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. In that context, we believe it is premature to call upon all States to immediately fulfil that obligation by commencing multilateral negotiations leading to the early conclusion of a convention prohibiting the development, production, testing, deployment, stockpiling, transfer and threat of use or use of nuclear weapons. We believe that such steady, incremental progress should be made before we embark upon the negotiations that draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39 calls upon all States to commence. That is why Japan abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

Finally, Japan continues to encourage all efforts aimed at advancing nuclear disarmament.

Ms. Borslin Bonnier (Sweden): I am taking the floor to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23. I do so on behalf of the New Agenda Coalition — Brazil, Egypt, Ireland, Mexico, New Zealand, South Africa and Sweden. We abstained in the voting on the draft resolution.

The New Agenda Coalition believes that it is essential that the commitments made at the 1995 and 2000 Review Conferences of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) be upheld in their entirety and as they were originally agreed. Some differences of interpretation in that regard underlie our abstention in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23. At the same time, we know and appreciate that Japan and the other sponsors share our goals and objectives concerning nuclear disarmament.

The 2005 NPT Review Conference is now approaching, and we believe that the time has come for us to look ahead and to work together to advance our common goals. The New Agenda Coalition stands ready to work together with Japan and the other sponsors towards that end and looks forward to doing so.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands) (*spoke in French*): I have the honour to take the floor on behalf of Belgium, Luxembourg and the Netherlands, as well as Germany and Norway, which have associated themselves with this explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.39, entitled "Follow-up to the advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons*".

We support the unanimous conclusion in the Court's advisory opinion that there exists an obligation to pursue in good faith and bring to a conclusion negotiations leading to nuclear disarmament in all its aspects under strict and effective international control. That is why we voted in favour of operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution.

However, although we share the opinion that the ultimate objective of nuclear disarmament is the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, we cannot support the draft resolution as a whole. We regret that

this draft resolution refers to only one element of the International Court's advisory opinion. The advisory opinion is indivisible, and it must be considered in its entirety.

Furthermore, we are firmly convinced that nuclear disarmament cannot be achieved except through a gradual process. At the sixth Review Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, States parties agreed on a series of practical steps in that regard. The international community should now focus on their implementation.

Mr. Vasiliev (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): I have requested the floor to speak in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

We note the efforts of the States of the New Agenda Coalition to prepare for the present session of the General Assembly a more concise and balanced text for the draft resolution on nuclear disarmament in order to increase support for it. Indeed, some of the controversial issues surrounding last year's draft resolution have not arisen this year. Unfortunately, the text was also shortened, at the expense of a number of the important provisions contained in last year's draft resolution. I am referring in particular to the provisions concerning the close link between strategic offensive and defensive weapons and the importance of prohibiting the deployment of weapons in outer space.

Russia is conscientiously implementing all its obligations to reduce its nuclear-weapon stockpiles. However, it is difficult for us to agree with the idea of accelerating the nuclear disarmament process. On many occasions — including during the present session of the First Committee — we have drawn attention to the reasons why nuclear disarmament must be implemented in a gradual process on the basis of a comprehensive approach, while respecting the principle of equal security for all States, without any artificial haste. Russia has supported and will continue to support realistic and balanced proposals in that regard, for example the proposals contained in draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons".

Unlike last year's text, the text of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22 does not mention any progress in the area of nuclear disarmament. However, as we have already pointed out, Russia is undertaking consistent, painstaking, labour-intensive and costly efforts to reduce and destroy its nuclear weapons, including within the framework of the Moscow Treaty on Strategic Offensive Reductions, which entered into force last year. There is no reference to that in the present draft resolution.

Those are some of the reasons why the Russian Federation abstained in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, on accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments.

Mr. Rivas (Colombia) (*spoke in Spanish*): Concerning operative paragraph 2 of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, as well as the eighteenth preambular paragraph and operative paragraph 3 (a) of draft resolution L.23, where mention is made of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT), Colombia would like to reiterate what it has said in previous statements in explanation of vote on those draft resolutions submitted last year on the same agenda items.

In accordance with international law and with Colombia's Political Constitution of 1991, the obligations undertaken in treaties signed by our country are binding only from the time ratification has occurred. Colombia has put forward these arguments publicly and in a transparent manner, over a four-year period, before the Provisional Technical Secretariat of the Organization of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBTO) and the Preparatory Commission for the Treaty and its subsidiary bodies.

Colombia reaffirms its commitment to the Treaty and will continue to propose approaches aimed at overcoming such constitutional impediments in order to make contributions to the Preparatory Commission prior to the ratification of that Treaty.

We appreciate the interest shown by a number of States in finding a solution to these obstacles that would allow us to ratify the Treaty as early as possible — something to which we aspire. The proposals we have made that aim to overcome this problem continue to be discussed in the context of the Preparatory Commission for the Treaty and its subsidiary bodies, in consultation with the Provisional Technical Secretariat. We hope that these discussions will lead to an early solution to the problem facing Colombia that will enable us to ratify the Treaty.

Mr. Prasad (India): I am taking the floor to explain India's vote on three resolutions under cluster 1 — A/C.1/59/L.22, A/C.1/59/L.23 and A/C.1/59/L.19/Rev.1.

Prior to so doing, I have to seek a clarification from the Chairman, and, if necessary, through the Chairman to the Swedish delegation, concerning the title of resolution A/C.1/59/L.22. I thought I heard my Swedish colleague state, when the draft resolution was introduced, that the title was: "Towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: accelerating implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Document A/C.1/59/L.22, however, has only the phrase "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

Informal paper No. 3 and informal paper No. 3/Rev.1, containing today's programme — provided to us by the Secretariat — states that the draft resolution is entitled, "A new agenda", etc. We do not know where this has come from, because we do not believe in a new agenda. I had rather liked what my Swedish colleague had first said in her statement. Could the Chairman clarify?

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I should be delighted. I will try to give the representative of India an answer, and the representative of Sweden, if she wishes to do so, could be more specific. I took the precaution of reading the revised versions in English and Spanish, which both have the same title, "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

References to the new agenda appear in the title of the cluster under which this draft resolution has been submitted: "General and complete disarmament: towards a nuclear-weapon-free world: a new agenda." The representative of Sweden may wish to add to that. I think that the titles of the English and Spanish versions match.

Ms. Borsiin Bonnier (Sweden): I am very appreciative of the attention paid by my Indian colleague to this matter. I am afraid that he is absolutely correct. The title, when it was introduced, was as he said. Changes were made during technical processing by the Secretariat. We decided not to object and have a revision, so there was a modification when the draft resolution came out, and the title henceforth is as appears in the draft resolution that has been adopted today.

Mr. Prasad (India): We compliment the sponsors of A/C.1/59/L.21 for having considerably shortened their draft resolution and for having removed many of the prescriptive suggestions that were not central to the principal objective of the draft resolution, which we share.

India believes that moves towards the creation of a nuclear-weapon-free world have to be grounded in the prevailing consensus contained in the Programme of Action of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament, to which all the then States Members of the United Nations were parties. That approach is still not fully reflected in A/C.1/59/L.22. Given that the draft resolution seeks a nuclear-weapon-free world, we should also have preferred references in it to the non-first use of nuclear weapons and also to the reduction of nuclear dangers, including through measures such as de-alert.

We also believe that efforts to create a nuclear-weapon-free world will be constrained by the intrinsic inequality and discriminatory framework of the obligations enshrined in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The need, instead, is to move towards a more durable system of international security based on the principle of equal and legitimate security for all.

It is for those reasons that the Indian delegation voted against operative paragraph 2 and abstained in the voting on the draft resolution as a whole.

I turn now to draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Even though India very much agrees with the basic objective of the draft resolution — the complete elimination of nuclear weapons — the Indian delegation voted against it because of what appears to us to be the flawed means recommended to pursue that objective.

India also agrees that nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation are intertwined and mutually reinforcing. However, we consider the principles of non-proliferation, as enshrined in the NPT, to be discriminatory. Moreover, operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution calls on India to join the NPT as a non-nuclear-weapon State. That is unrealistic and unacceptable. India is prepared to go beyond this divisive debate and remains committed to working for equal and legitimate security for all through global disarmament.

A brief word now on A/C.1/59/L.19. The draft resolution, on Mongolia's international security and nuclear-weapon-free status, which was adopted without a vote, has India's full support. India maintains the most friendly and fraternal ties with Mongolia and welcomes the many steps Mongolia has taken to reinforce its nuclear-weapon-free status.

We note that Mongolia has received support and security assurances for such status from Member States, particularly those that possess nuclear weapons. We note also that Mongolia is seeking to institutionalize, at the international level, the status of its territory as a nuclear-weapon-free zone.

India fully respects the choice made by Mongolia, and is willing to respond, whenever required, with every possible support and commitment, to Mongolia's nuclear-weapon-free status.

Mr. Heinsberg (Germany): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolutions A/C.1/59/L.22 and A/C.1/59/L.23.

First, I will address draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, introduced by the New Agenda Coalition, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Germany voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22. Germany recalls NATO's commitment to strengthening the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), the cornerstone of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament, and to ensuring full compliance with it by all States parties to the Treaty.

Since the end of the cold war, NATO has taken far-reaching steps to adapt its overall strategy, policy and force posture, and has radically reduced its reliance on nuclear forces. Alliance nations have dramatically reduced nuclear weapons and their delivery systems. At the same time, the continuing existence of powerful nuclear forces outside the alliance constitutes a significant factor which the alliance has to take into account in maintaining security and stability in the Euro-Atlantic region, on the basis of its strategic concept.

Germany believes that disarmament and non-proliferation efforts must go hand in hand. Nuclear disarmament is inextricably linked to non-proliferation. While voting in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, Germany feels obliged to emphasize its serious concerns with regard to the threat posed by the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and their delivery systems.

Now I will explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, introduced by Japan, "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Germany fully shares the commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation and, in particular, to the full implementation by all States parties of their obligations under the NPT. The NPT remains a cornerstone of the nuclear non-proliferation regime and the essential foundation of nuclear disarmament. The Final Document of the 2000 NPT Review Conference, and its adoption by consensus, constituted an important step for the NPT and for the nuclear non-proliferation regime as a whole. We attach particular importance to the progressive and full implementation of the practical steps included in the Final Document, as they chart the way to nuclear disarmament.

Unfortunately, draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23 leaves room for possible misinterpretation as regards the commitment to the full implementation of the practical steps for the systematic and progressive efforts to implement article VI of the NPT, as agreed by the 2000 NPT Review Conference, because the draft resolution does not reflect those steps in their entirety.

That remains the weak point of the draft resolution, and justifies concerns which had arisen in previous years. In the light of the clear commitment to the cause of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation expressed in the draft resolution — which we fully share — Germany voted in favour. However, we must underline this year again that we do not interpret the selective quoting in the draft resolution as detracting from the comprehensive commitment by the States parties to the NPT to implement the conclusions of the Final Document in their entirety.

Mr. Faessler (Switzerland) (*spoke in French*): The delegation of Switzerland is taking the floor in explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Switzerland voted in favour of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22. By its decision this year, Switzerland honours what is sees as the willingness of the sponsors to modify the content of the draft resolution by avoiding a number of controversial issues, in order to broaden support for the text. We hope that this will help create favourable conditions for the 2005 Review Conference of the

Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to achieve significant results.

We continue to support a realistic and pragmatic approach to disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation, and Switzerland's position on the draft resolution does not reflect a change in our principles on this matter.

In conclusion, Switzerland has stressed on many occasions the importance of improved implementation of existing commitments in the areas of nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. Rivasseau (France) (*spoke in French*): I am taking the floor on behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and France, to explain our vote against draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments". Similar texts have been put forward over a number of years, and they have contained important elements that we support. However, when the draft resolution on this matter was introduced last year, we were sorry to note that the text also contained many elements that did not command consensus and that were not acceptable to the United Kingdom, the United States and France.

We note that this year's text reflects a more pragmatic approach, but there are elements that we cannot accept. The new title does not reflect the progress that has been achieved in the sphere of nuclear disarmament. The content does not take sufficient account of the full range of obligations for all of us in the area of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

As we stated in our explanation of vote on last year's draft resolution, the United Kingdom, the United States and France remain fully committed to meeting their obligations under article VI of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. We have taken significant steps in the area of nuclear disarmament and support worldwide reductions in nuclear weapons. Unfortunately, the draft resolution does not sufficiently take into account the progress that has been made in that area. While last year's draft resolution mentioned the Moscow Treaty, this year's does not. It fails to do so despite the fact that the Treaty commits the United States and the Russian Federation to reduce their nuclear arsenals by several thousand warheads over the next decade.

Our nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation commitments remain steadfast and are rooted in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. As we turn our attention to the forthcoming Review Conference, due to take place here in New York in the spring, we hope that ongoing dialogue among States parties will help ensure that the progress made following previous review conferences will lead to the further strengthening of this cornerstone of the global non-proliferation and disarmament regime.

Mr. Alhariri (Syrian Arab Republic) (*spoke in Arabic*): My delegation would like to explain its vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". We support the draft resolution on the basis of our full support for the efforts being made in the area of nuclear disarmament. We would like, however, to put on record our reservations about those references in the draft resolution that move us away from the goal of complete disarmament and weaken the efforts that have been made in that direction. The fact that paragraph 3 refers to the 1995 Review and Extension Conference of the Parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), but not to the Final Document of the 2000 Review Conference, leads us to wonder whether the intention is to achieve genuine nuclear disarmament. Furthermore, we are of the view that the draft resolution does not fully assert the basic principles of nuclear disarmament or the importance of achieving the universality of the NPT.

My delegation hopes that those flaws will be corrected so that in future we can move in the right direction.

Mr. Elahi (Pakistan): My delegation would like to express its deep appreciation to the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments", for the changes they have made to the draft resolution this year. Those changes represent a vast improvement compared with earlier similar draft resolutions. The draft resolution calls for meaningful disarmament measures and emphasizes the role of the Conference on Disarmament in that context. Those are elements which Pakistan has always supported. At the same time, elements of the draft resolutions of previous years to which we had objected have been eliminated this year.

Pakistan therefore voted in favour of the draft resolution, while abstaining on paragraph 2 for reasons that are well known.

My delegation abstained in the vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, entitled "A path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons". Pakistan does not agree with several of the provisions of that draft resolution. It places inordinate emphasis on non-proliferation, rather than on nuclear disarmament, which represents a regression in this vital area, and it does not represent a path to the total elimination of nuclear weapons, which is what the draft resolution is supposed to be all about. Furthermore, we cannot endorse the content of some of the preambular paragraphs. The fact that several paragraphs of the draft resolution are centred on the provisions of the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons made it difficult for Pakistan to consider voting in favour of it. For those reasons, my delegation abstained.

Mr. Luaces (United States of America): Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23 asserts, as its previous iterations have done, the importance of the urgent signature and ratification of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT) with a view to achieving its early entry into force. The United States does not support the CTBT, and will not become a party to it. Moreover, the draft resolution calls for the negotiation in the Conference on Disarmament of an effectively verifiable fissile material cut-off treaty. While the United States continues to support negotiating such a treaty in the Conference on Disarmament, our internal review earlier this year concluded that such a treaty could not be made effectively verifiable. We are in no doubt as to the good intentions of the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.23, especially given the clear efforts to make the language more balanced than in past versions. But, for the reasons that I have given, the United States was again obliged to vote against the draft resolution.

Mr. Lew (Republic of Korea): I would like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.22, entitled "Accelerating the implementation of nuclear disarmament commitments".

This year, my delegation has changed its position from abstention to support. Compared with last year's draft resolution, which included some elements that were not acceptable to my country, in our view the New Agenda Coalition's draft resolution this year takes a balanced and more realistic approach. In addition, the draft resolution highlights certain specific areas in relation to nuclear disarmament to which my delegation attaches particular importance, including universal adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the early entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty and the beginning of negotiations on a fissile material cut-off treaty.

Although we believe that the draft resolution still leaves room for further improvement, my delegation, taking into account the positive aspects to which I referred, has decided to support the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We turn now to the one draft resolution under cluster 6, as listed in Informal Paper No. 3/Rev.1. The sponsors have requested that the draft resolution be considered at a future meeting.

If I hear no objection to that request, the Committee will consider that draft resolution on Monday, 1 November.

The Committee will now turn to consideration of cluster 7, "Disarmament machinery".

I call on the representative of Israel, who has asked to speak in explanation of vote before the voting.

Mr. Bar (Israel): My intention is to give an explanation of vote on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1, "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

We have decided to join the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1 despite our disappointment with its present text, which does not reflect the full scope of the work that took place in the Conference on Disarmament this year. The so-called out-of-the-box issues have been extensively discussed in the Conference on Disarmament throughout the year. That reality, unfortunately, has not been reflected in the draft resolution before us, and we again would like to express our disappointment in that regard.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft A/C.1/59/L.14, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to

disarmament". I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.14, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Malaysia, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Non-Aligned Movement, at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in document A/C.1/59/L.14. In addition, Somalia and Jamaica have now become sponsors of the draft resolution.

In connection with draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.14, entitled "Convening of the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament", I wish to put on record the following statement on financial implications on behalf of the Secretary-General.

By operative paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 of the draft resolution, the General Assembly would decide to establish an open-ended working group, working on the basis of consensus, to consider the objectives and agenda, including the possible establishment of the preparatory committee, for the fourth special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament; request the open-ended Working Group to hold an organizational session in order to set the date for its substantive sessions in 2006, and to submit a report on its work, including possible substantive recommendations, before the end of the sixtieth session of the General Assembly; and request the Secretary-General, within existing resources, to provide the open-ended Working Group with the necessary assistance and services as may be required to discharge its tasks.

Pursuant to the above requests, it is envisaged that the open-ended working group will hold four meetings in 2006 in New York. The exact dates for those meetings will be determined in consultation between the substantive secretariat and the Department of General Assembly Affairs and Conference Management, subject to the availability of conference facilities and services allocated to the General Assembly and its working groups and on the condition that no two working groups of the General Assembly would meet simultaneously.

The conference servicing requirements at full cost are estimated in 2006 at $190,786. The extent to which the Organization's capacity would need to be supplemented by temporary assistance resources can be determined only in the light of the calendar of conferences and meetings for the biennium 2006-2007. Provision for such requirements would be considered under the relevant section for conference services of the proposed programme budget for the biennium 2006-2007, not only for meetings programmed at the time of budget preparation, but also for meetings authorized subsequently, provided that the number and distribution of meetings are consistent with the pattern of meetings of past years.

Accordingly, should the General Assembly adopt draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.14, no additional requirements would arise for the programme budget for the biennium 2004-2005. The attention of the Committee is drawn to the provisions of section VI of General Assembly resolution 45/248 B of 21 December 1990, in which the Assembly reaffirms that the Fifth Committee is the appropriate Main Committee of the General Assembly entrusted with responsibilities for administrative and budgetary matters, and reaffirmed also the role of the Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.14 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.24, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Nigeria, on behalf of States Members of the United Nations that are members of the Group of African States, at the 15th meeting, on 22 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.24 and

A/C.1/59/INF/2. In addition, Somalia has now become sponsors of the draft resolution.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/58/L.24 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament".

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the Conference on Disarmament". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Myanmar at the Committee's 16th meeting, held on 25 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1 and A/C.1/59/INF/2.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.27/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolutions in thematic cluster 8, "Other disarmament measures".

The Committee will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction".

I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will now proceed to take a decision on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of India at the Committee's 15th meeting, held on 22 October 2004. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.31 and A/C.1/59/INF/2 and Addenda 1, 3, 4 and 5. The following countries have also become sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31: Bulgaria, Ireland, Italy, Kyrgyzstan, Portugal and Serbia and Montenegro.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31 have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I now call on those delegations wishing to speak in explanation of position on draft resolutions in this thematic cluster.

Mr. Elahi (Pakistan): I would like to explain Pakistan's position on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31, just adopted, entitled "Measures to prevent terrorists from acquiring weapons of mass destruction".

When in March 1995 the terrorist group Aum Shinrikyo used sarin nerve agent to launch a chemical attack in the Tokyo subway system, the incident tragically illustrated the consequences of the use of chemical agents for terrorist purposes. The case also illustrated the need for national authorities in all countries to remain vigilant concerning the possibility of such groups working to acquire highly dangerous and lethal capabilities.

We therefore support the objectives of the draft resolution, although we believe that its language could have been improved to convey a more objective reflection of reality. For, even in the Aum Shinrikyo case, investigations established that despite the considerable financial resources and the know-how of that outfit, it had failed logistically in its other plans to produce weapons of mass destruction.

The best guarantee against the threat of the possible use of nuclear, chemical or biological weapons is their elimination. The Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons is doing important work in promoting the universality of the Chemical Weapons Convention and its national implementation by States parties. Comprehensive national implementation — which includes both legal and administrative measures to ensure proper accounting and control of trade in relevant substances — in itself ensures denial of those materials for any illegal purposes, including terrorist ones.

A serious concern, however, relates to the alarmingly slow pace of destruction of weaponized chemical agents by the major possessor States. As long as those weapons remain in existence — and in such huge quantities — the possibility of their falling into the hands of terrorists also remains. Unfortunately, a compliance mechanism which would have placed the implementation of the Biological Weapons Convention on the same footing as that of the Chemical Weapons Convention was scuttled after six years of intensive negotiations owing to a minority veto. We are convinced that a revival of that process would fully serve the goal of promoting international peace and security, and would also address the concerns expressed, for example, in the draft resolution we have just adopted.

The draft resolution quite appropriately mentions the Final Document of the thirteenth Non-Aligned Movement Summit as having expressed itself on the issue of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. We would just like to recall that, in the context of the issue of terrorism, that document also stresses the need to address the causes that sometimes lead to terrorism — causes that lie in oppression, injustice and deprivation.

Mr. Paranhos (Brazil): I would like to refer to our position with regard to draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.31.

The resolution makes reference in its fourth preambular paragraph to Security Council resolution 1540 (2004), which was adopted with the support of Brazil. We would like to take this opportunity to state our understanding that Council resolution 1540 (2004) is specific, and addresses the threat of weapons of mass destruction falling into the hands of terrorists and other non-State actors.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I call on the representative of the Netherlands for a general comment.

Mr. Sanders (Netherlands): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union (EU) to make a general statement on draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.35, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". The candidate countries Bulgaria, Romania, Turkey and Croatia; the countries of the Stabilization and Association Process and potential candidates Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, and Serbia and Montenegro; and the European Free Trade Association country Norway, member of the European Economic area, align themselves with this statement.

The European Union welcomes draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.35, which all its member States have co-sponsored and which we hope will be adopted without a vote. The European Union attaches great importance to the issues of security, non-proliferation and disarmament in the Mediterranean region. As was stated in the EU strategy against proliferation of weapons of mass destruction adopted by our leaders in December 2003, "security in Europe is closely linked to security and stability in the Mediterranean". That concept is specifically mentioned in operative paragraph 1 of the draft resolution before us, which also recognizes that prospects for closer Euro-Mediterranean cooperation in all spheres can be enhanced by positive developments worldwide, in particular in Europe, in the Maghreb and in the Middle East.

The Barcelona or Euro-Mediterranean Partnership process, launched in 1995 as the Mediterranean dimension of the EU's external policy, has made a major contribution to the establishment and development of a global partnership between the European Union, its member countries and the Mediterranean partners. That partnership includes engagements regarding non-proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, disarmament, nuclear-weapon-free zones, verification, conventional weapons and confidence-building measures. The European Union attaches particular importance to the goal of transforming the Mediterranean into a sea of peace, stability, cooperation and development, as well as, and above all, security.

In the context of working towards strengthening security and stability in that crucial region, the EU warmly welcomes Libya's decision to eliminate all material, equipment and programmes that lead to the production of weapons of mass destruction and their means of delivery, together with the practical steps it has undertaken since to implement that decision. The case of Libya demonstrates that the problems of proliferation can, with good will, be tackled through discussion and engagement, that countries can abandon programmes voluntarily and peacefully, and that States have nothing to fear from coming forward and admitting non-compliance.

The European Union calls on all States of the Mediterranean region that have not yet done so to accede to all the multilaterally negotiated legally binding instruments in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation in order to strengthen peace and cooperation in the region.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.35, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". I give the floor to the Secretary of the Committee.

Ms. Stoute (Secretary of the Committee): The Committee will proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/59/L.35, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region". The draft resolution was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 16th meeting, on 25 October. The sponsors of the draft resolution are listed in documents A/C.1/59/L.35 and A/C.1/59/INF/2 and Add.3.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): The sponsors of the draft resolution have expressed the wish that the draft resolution be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I will take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/59/L.35 was adopted.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): We have thus concluded our consideration of the draft resolutions contained in Informal Paper No. 3/Rev.1.

Next week, we will consider the draft resolutions contained in Informal Paper No. 4.

Other matters

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I wish to remind representatives that the awards ceremony for the United Nations Disarmament Fellowships will be held immediately following the adjournment of this meeting.

Although there are no official meetings of the Committee tomorrow, there will be consultations, and I wish to remind representatives in particular that, in my capacity as Chairman, I shall be holding open-ended consultations on the report which the Committee is to submit to the General Assembly under resolution 58/316, with specific regard to the agenda. I urge representatives to play an active role in those and other consultations.

I would like to conclude this meeting by briefly addressing a question raised by the delegation of Egypt with respect to the financial situation and programme of the Conference on Disarmament. I would like to inform the delegation of Egypt that the Secretariat has reminded me that such questions are dealt with in the Fifth Committee. They have offered to bring the question to the attention of the Fifth Committee in order to provide the requested information. I would like to offer to personally bring the question to the Chairman of the Fifth Committee in order to obtain most expeditiously the response requested by the delegation of Egypt. I underline that this does not mean that other members of this Committee are not in a position to learn any information the Fifth Committee, as a Main Committee of the General Assembly, provides. It is a simple question of raising matters in the appropriate body, not in any way a question of concealing information.

Does the delegation of Egypt agree to that manner of proceeding?

Mr. Shamaa (Egypt): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your explanation. We do indeed ask you to be good enough to inquire of the Chairman of the Fifth Committee about the costs of the Conference on Disarmament.

The Chairman (*spoke in Spanish*): I shall bring the matter to the attention of the Chairman of the Fifth Committee, independent of the action of the appropriate Secretariat offices, which have brought the matter to the attention of the Fifth Committee's secretariat.

The meeting rose at 5.20 p.m.